

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Internet - CONHS Earth Terminal Source Selection Plan

Contracting Officer, FBIS

EXTENSION

NO.

FBIS-1484/85

DATE

4 October 1985

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1.

D/FBIS, 1013 Key

2.

C/PMS/DDS&T, 6E34 Hqs

10/10

10/10

[Signature]

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

(Force) - This is

10/11

memo which he requested be left undated.

10.

11.

12.

C/E&PS/FBIS

13.

P.S.

[Signature] signed 1209

14.

15.

FBIS-1484/85
4 October 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director, Foreign Broadcast Information Service
Chief, Procurement Management Staff, DDS&T

FROM:

Contracting Officer, FBIS

SUBJECT:

Internet - CONUS Earth Terminal Source Selection Plan

Attached please find the subject plan for your review and approval.

Attachment

APPROVED:

Director, Foreign Broadcast Information Service

Date

CONUS EARTH TERMINAL SOURCE SELECTION PLAN

1.0 Overview

This plan describes the process that shall be followed during the evaluation of proposals for the CONUS Earth Terminal, RFP-16-85. Each step is described in the sections that follow. Appendix A lists the personnel who shall participate in the evaluation process. Appendix B contains the evaluation plan. Appendix C contains a projected evaluation and negotiation schedule.

1.1 Receive and Distribute Proposals

The evaluation process shall be coordinated by the FBIS Contracting Officer (CO), who will assist the Source Selection Authority (SSA), and the Chief Field Engineering Division, FBIS. When proposals are received, the FBIS/CO shall log each proposal and forward the required number of copies to the chairpersons of the respective evaluation panels and the source evaluation board chairperson. The cost evaluation panel shall receive only the cost sections of the proposals; the technical/management evaluation panel shall receive the technical and the management proposals.

The function of the evaluation panels is to evaluate each offerors proposal against the criteria established in the RFP. The evaluation panels shall identify, within the scope of its evaluation area, items within each proposal which are ambiguous, uncertain and unclear; items which are responsive to the RFP; and items which are deficient. A "deficiency" is defined as a requirement as established in the RFP that is not satisfied in the proposal.

2.0 Evaluations

2.1 Technical & Management Evaluation

Technical & Management evaluations shall be performed by the technical panel. These evaluations shall be performed independently of the cost. However, interaction with the cost evaluation panel shall be allowed if needed, as determined by the Contracting Officer. The technical & management evaluation panel shall utilize the evaluation criteria and procedure described in Appendix B of this document. The panel shall report the results of its evaluations to the SEB. The reports shall contain the following:

A list of the strong and weak points of each proposal, and identification of potential risks.

A list of deficiencies for each proposal, specifying items to which the proposal is nonresponsive, from technical & management standpoints.

A summary of the point score ratings awarded to each proposal during the evaluation process. The summary shall represent a consensus of the panel. Should any member(s) of the panel hold a minority opinion regarding the evaluation(s) and/or ranking, a minority report shall accompany the panel report and the minority report shall detail the basis and rationale for the dissenting opinion. The panel summary shall include an overall narrative evaluation of each proposal.

2.2 Cost Evaluation

The cost evaluation shall be performed by the cost evaluation panel and shall initially be conducted independently of the technical and management evaluations. At the conclusion of the evaluation, the panel shall submit a cost evaluation report to the SEB containing the following:

A list of deficiencies for each proposal, specifying items to which the proposal is nonresponsive, from a cost standpoint.

A list of cost items for each proposal which requires further clarification.

A list of the Offerors whose proposed costs deviate significantly from the Government "should cost" estimate.

3.0 Determination of Offerors in the Competitive Range

The SEB, using the reports and evaluations from the respective panels, shall recommend to the Source Selection Official (SSO) the offerors considered to be in the competitive range. An Offeror is in the competitive range if he has a reasonable chance of being selected for contract award after the final offers are received. Offerors whose proposals contain deficiencies may still be considered to be in the competitive range. This would be the case if, in the judgement of the SEB, it is feasible for the Offeror to correct the deficiencies in a final offer. The SEB shall submit recommendations to the SSO. The recommendation shall contain the following:

A rank ordered list of offerors recommended to be in the competitive range.

A list of deficiencies for each proposal.

A list of items needing further clarification for each proposal.

A list of Offerors no longer considered to be in the competitive range and the reasons for this determination.

Upon the SSO's approval the SEB shall make a presentation of its recommendations to the SSA for approval. The SSA shall make the final determination regarding those offerors to be considered in the competitive range.

4.0 Discussions and Negotiations

The Contracting Officer shall notify each offeror in the competitive range that he is still being considered for contract award. He shall hold discussions with each of these offerors and provide a list of areas in which the offeror is deficient. The Contracting Officer shall solicit clarification for those areas of each proposal which are unclear. He shall ask that revised offers be submitted by the offerors which remain in the competitive range. Offerors shall have an opportunity to correct their areas of noncompliance in their revised offers. The Contracting Officer shall also notify each Offeror who is not in the competitive range that he is no longer being considered for contract award, and he shall provide the reasons for dropping the Offeror from contention, if formally requested. At the completion of discussions and negotiations, the Contracting Officer shall place a common cutoff date for the submission of revised offers.

5.0 Receive Final Proposals

The Contracting Officer shall distribute the final proposals in the same manner as the original proposals were distributed.

6.0 Final Evaluation

Each of the evaluation panels shall evaluate the final offers using the same criteria and procedures used during the initial evaluation, as stated previously. Each evaluation panel shall deliver a final evaluation report to the SEB. The format of the reports shall be the same as used in the initial evaluation reports.

7.0 Source Evaluation Board Recommendation

Using the results of the previous evaluation and considering other factors the SEB shall recommend which offeror(s) is/are most likely to perform in the manner most advantageous to the Government. The Board shall make a formal written recommendation to the SSO which offerors are to be considered for further negotiations and contract award.

8.0 Contract Award

The SSO shall consider the recommendations of the SEB and shall recommend to the contracting officer (SSA) which offeror(s) recommended for contract award. Should the SSO decide award of the contract is to be made to an Offeror other than the selection recommended to him by the SEB, he must document his rationale for doing so in the form of a memorandum to the SSA with a copy to be furnished to the SEB. The SSA shall make, with Agency Contract Review Board approval, the final determination regarding contract award.

9.0 Agency Contract Review Board (ACRB)

The FBIS Contracting Officer and the SEB Chairperson shall prepare the ACRB docket recommending award to the selected offeror and formally present the case. Negotiations, award or other action as directed by the ACRB shall be instituted as appropriate.

Page Denied

Engineering Division
EVALUATION PLAN

1. COST - 40%

1.1 Government Should Cost - 30%

The scoring will be on a linear basis from the government's cost estimate, of \$ 3484K as derived from the Collins International Service Company, INTERNET Study. This cost is for the earth terminal and the microwave and does not include O&M costs. O&M is estimated at 500K per year. Points will range from 30 to zero.

1.2 Cost Realism - 10%

Cost evaluation will consider cost realism (at the lowest cost) or lack thereof to assess the offeror's understanding of the requirements of the RFP. Cost realism also includes the degree of the Government's confidence in the offeror's ability to perform at or within its estimated cost.

2. TECHNICAL - 30%

2.1 Civil Engineering Design - 10%

Meeting local codes and criteria, and quality of materials and workmanship as documented in the proposal.

2.2 Commo Link Design - 5%

The degree of immunity to fading/outages, and ease of maintainability. It is assumed that prior to this evaluation, it is verified that the link will not degrade the s/n quoted in the RFP.

2.3 Earth Terminal Design - 15%

The soundness of equipment mixture, reliability and quality of selected subsystems.

3. MANAGEMENT - 16%

3.1 Corporate Experience - 4%

Projects of similar characteristics and scope in which the Contractor was the prime contractor. Includes all available corporate resources: facilities, financial, personnel, etc.

3.2 personnel Experience - 4%

Qualifications and experience of Project Manager

Proper mix of Personnel from prime and subcontractors skills.

3.3 Subcontractor Selection and Experience - 8%

3.3.1 - Selection of subcontractors, qualifications, and experience to include methods of control established by the prime - 4%

3.3.2 - Experience in managing subcontractors for similar projects - 4%

4. SCHEDULE - 14%

Schedule evaluations shall be performed on a linear basis whereby the shortest period of contractor performance shall be accorded the highest evaluation score and the longest period of performance the lowest score, with intervening scores proportionally allocated based upon the period of performance.

INTERNET CONUS EARTH TERMINAL RFP
EVALUATION AND NEGOTIATION SCHEDULE

| <u>TARGET DATE</u> | <u>ACTIVITY</u> |
|--------------------|---|
| 9 October | Panel Members Briefing |
| 10 October | Proposals due from offerors |
| 10 October | Evaluation panel chairpersons and auditor receive copies of proposals |
| 17 October | Evaluations complete & Panel reports due to SSEB |
| 18 October | SEB recommends competitive range to SSO and SSA |
| 21 October | Discussions with offerors in the competitive range |
| 25 October | Revised proposal(s) due |
| 27 October | Revised proposal evaluations complete by panels & submitted to SEB |
| 28 October | SEB recommendation to SSO and SSA |
| 29 October | Docket due to the Contract Review Board |
| 5 November | Presentation to CRB |
| 6 November | Negotiations with contractor(s) to whom award is anticipated |
| 6 November | Contract award |
| 12 November | Debriefings to non-selected contractors |